



न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन

COURT OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (DIVYANGJAN)
 दिव्यांगजन सशक्तिकरण विभाग/Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan)
 सामाजिक न्याय और अधिकारिता मंत्रालय/Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment
 भारत सरकार/Government of India
 5वाँ तल, एन.आई.एस.डी. भवन, जी-2, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075 दूरभाष : (011) 20892364
 5th Floor, N.I.S.D. Bhawan, G-2, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075; Tel.: (011) 20892364
 Email: ccpd@nic.in; Website: www.ccpd.nic.in

Case No. 14610/1102/2023

In the matter of-

Sameer Tiwari

...Complainant

Versus

The MD & CEO
 Bank of Baroda
 Central Office, P.O. Box No. 10046,
 9th Floor, Baroda Corporate Centre,
 Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East),
 Mumbai-400 051
 Email: md&ceo@bankofbaroda.com

...Respondent No.1

The Branch Manager,
 Bank of Baroda,
 Safdarjung Hospital Branch,
 Delhi – 110929,
 Email: safec@bankofbaroda.com

...Respondent No.2

The Branch Manager,
 Bank of Baroda,
 Govindpuri Branch, Saroj Tower,
 591, Guru Ravidas Marg,
 Kalkaji Extension,
 Delhi – 110019

...Respondent No.3

1. Gist of the case:

1.1 The petitioner, Sameer Tiwari, a person with 50% intellectual disability filed his complaint dated 06.11.2023 and submitted that Complainant is unable to get a savings bank account opened due to repeated denial and non-cooperation by officials of Bank of Baroda branches (respondents). Despite a court-appointed limited guardian and submission of all required documents, the bank cited baseless technical and procedural issues, violating the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

1.2 The petitioner seeks accountability, penalties on the respondents, and court directions to ensure compliance and accessibility.

2. Notice to respondent:

A Notice dated 15.11.2023 was issued to the Respondent for forwarding their comments within 30 days to this Court u/s 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act").

3. Reply filed by the Respondent:

3.1 The Respondent No. 2 filed a reply dated 13.12.2023, and explains the circumstances around the delay in opening a Savings Bank Account for the complainant:

3.1.1 On 13.03.2023, the complainant's father approached the Respondent Bank to open an account. The required documents were not submitted, resulting in the rejection of the request by the centralized account office (RLBO) at Gift City, Gandhinagar.

3.1.2 In September 2023, the complainant's father revisited the bank. The manager suggested opening the account at the nearby Govindpuri Branch for convenience.

3.1.3 The father agreed and approached the Govindpuri Branch, which then initiated steps to unsuspend the customer ID but encountered technical issues, as changes could only be made by RLBO. Despite multiple efforts, technical glitches prevented the timely modification and opening of the account.

3.1.4 A formal note in the account opening form acknowledged the delay

due to these technical problems. The account was eventually opened on 22.11.2023 and became operational on 28.11.2023.

3.1.5 The Bank maintains it acted in good faith and made sincere efforts to resolve the issues. The delay was purely technical and unintentional. The Respondents express regret over the inconvenience and confirm their continued commitment to serve persons with disabilities diligently.

3.1.6 Respondent No. 2 requests this Court to dismiss the complaint as the matter has now been resolved.

4. Seeking the current status of the case:

An email dated 07.07.2025 has been sent to Complainant and Respondent to seek the current status of the case.

5. Response from the parties:

An email dated 18.07.2025 was received from the complainant stating that the family pension account has been opened for the complainant and the issue has been resolved. He requested the closure of the Complaint.

6. Observation and Recommendation:

6.1 Upon considering the facts of the case and the material available on the records of the case, till date, it is apparent that the grievance of the complainant had already been redressed. As such, no further intervention of this Court is required.

6.2 Accordingly, the case is disposed of with the approval of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities.

(Praveen Prakash Ambashta)
Dy. Chief Commissioner